



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Llewellyn, 31 L. J. Ch., 658; *Coles v. Pilkington*, L. R. 19 Eq., 174. Two theories are advanced for the reason of this rule: On the one hand, it is said that great injustice would be done the donee by refusing to grant specific performance; *Wainwright v. Talcott*, 60 Conn., 43; and on the other hand, that the possession and improvements are the equivalent of an actual consideration. *Seavey v. Drake*, 62 N. H., 393; *Guynn v. McCauley*, 32 Ark., 97. But the court will not decree specific performance where the donee merely takes possession, without making improvements. *Anderson v. Scott*, 94 Mo., 637; *West v. Webster*, 39 Tex. Civ. App., 272. To warrant interference by a court of equity, the improvements made by the donee must be valuable and permanent; *Price v. Lloyd*, 31 Utah, 86; his possession must be actual and not constructive; *Griggsby v. Osborne*, 82 Va., 371; and the possession must be taken, and the improvements made, in reliance on the gift. *Bigelow v. Bigelow*, 93 Me., 439. It is well settled that the possession and improvements are sufficient part performance to take the transaction out of the Statute of Frauds. *Anderson v. Shockley*, 82 Mo., 250; *Truman v. Truman*, 79 Iowa, 506. If specific performance is denied on account of doubt as to the proof, the court will decree compensation to the donee for the improvements made. *Worth v. Worth*, 84 Ill., 442.

STREET RAILROADS—INJURIES—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.—*ASHLEY v. JOLINE*, 126 N. Y. SUPP., 3.—*Held*, that in an action for injuries received while crossing a street car track that plaintiff did not show herself free from contributory negligence, there being nothing to prevent her from seeing car, had she looked. *Gavegan, J., dissenting*.

This decision is not in accord with the general rule of law on the subject, which is that failure to look before attempting to cross a street car track, does not *per se* constitute negligence, but is a question for the jury in every case. *Pyne v. Broadway Electric Ry.*, 19 N. Y. Supp., 217; *Benjamin v. Holyoke Ry. Co.*, 16 Mass., 3. There are many cases holding that it is negligence as a matter of law not to look before attempting to cross a steam railroad, but that such is not the case in regard to crossing a street car track. *Smith v. Minneapolis City Ry.*, 90 Minn., 254. In some jurisdictions, however, it has been held that the same rule applies alike to both steam railroads and street railways. *Berger v. Philadelphia R. T. Co.*, 141 Fed., 1020. With a state of facts similar to the present case, late decisions have said, without laying down any general rule, that there was no contributory negligence as a matter of law and the facts should go to the jury. *Daum v. N. J. St. Ry. Co.*, 70 N. J. Law, 338; *Priesmyer v. St. Louis Transit Co.*, 102 Mo. App., 518.